



**A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN MACHEN AND MCINTIRE  
CONCERNING THEIR VIEW OF THE CHURCH AS RELATED  
TO THEIR INFLUENCE ON THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN  
KOREA**

by

**CHUL HONG**

**Submitted as part of the requirements**

**for the degree of  
PHILOSOPHIAE DOCTOR  
in the Faculty of Theology**

**University of Pretoria**

**PROMOTER: PROFESSOR J. W. HOFMEYR**

**March 2001**



## ABSTRACT

J. Gresham Machen provided the fundamentalist movement with intellectual leadership by writing several important books including *Christianity and Liberalism* (1923), the thesis of which is that Christianity and liberalism are entirely different religions because of their different assumptions. He has striven to reform within the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America(PCUSA). He founded Westminster Theological Seminary in 1929 and formed the Independent Board for the Presbyterian Foreign Missions. He contended that the PCUSA had to be a confessional church and require its teaching officers to subscribe to the Westminster Standards.

Carl McIntire was an admirer of Machen, and he joined the fight against liberalism. But they were driven from the PCUSA after their effort to reform the church over the issue of apostasy. They formed the Presbyterian Church of America(PCA). Yet within less than a year after the PCA was formed, in June of 1937, it was divided. There were the differences of opinion between Machen and McIntire during the period from early 1936 to January 1, 1937, when Machen died. And these differences primarily focused on the three distinct issues that represented also the differences between the majority and the minority of the PCA that would become later the Orthodox Presbyterian Church(OPC) and the Bible Presbyterian Church(BPC), respectively: dispensationalism, Christian liberty, and church polity. In other words, these differences were the reason for the division of the PCA and the BPC.

Machen represents the Old School element of doctrinal orthodoxy and lack of dynamic evangelistic thrust within conservative Presbyterianism in America. McIntire later began the Twentieth Century Reformation Movement. He represents the New School element of doctrinal latitude and evangelistic thrust in the heritage of Presbyterian fundamentalism. In terms of the doctrine of the church, while McIntire was a separatist, Machen did not hold to separatism. Also, Machen and McIntire exerted a great influence on the Korean Presbyterian Church especially through two great Korean theologians – Hyung Nong Park and Yune Sun Park. The Korean Presbyterian Church should pursue unity on the basis of doctrinal purity of the Reformed theology.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	
INTRODUCTION .....	1
I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND .....	18
1. Two Traditions in American Presbyterianism .....	18
2. From Evangelical Empire to Marginalized Fundamentalism .....	38
3. Fundamentalist-Modernist Controversy .....	45
II. THE INFLUENCE MACHEN HAD ON MCINTIRE .....	75
1. The Fundamentalist Heritage .....	75
(1) The European Legacy .....	75
(2) The American Legacy .....	77
2. The Influence Machen Had on McIntire .....	82
(1) Machen's Thought and Theology .....	85
(2) Machen's Influence on McIntire .....	96
III. THE DIFFERENCES OF THOUGHT BETWEEN MACHEN AND MCINTIRE ....	101
IV. THE INFLUENCE OF MACHEN AND MCINTIRE ON THE KOREAN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH .....	139
1. Historical Background .....	139
2. The Influence of the American Missionaries on the Korean Presbyterian Church ...	147
3. Machen's Influence on the Korean Presbyterian Church .....	153
4. McIntire's Influence on the Korean Presbyterian Church .....	167
CONCLUSION .....	175
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	195

## INTRODUCTION

J. Gresham Machen was a brilliant professor of New Testament at Princeton Theological Seminary and provided intellectual leadership for fundamentalism, which arose as a reaction against modernism.<sup>1)</sup> It may be said that modernism is, in a sense, the product of evolutionism and higher criticism, since modernists applied the methods of naturalistic science to the study of the Bible and religion. When modernism began to infiltrate the colleges, seminaries, and churches of America, some conservatives were convinced that the age of apostasy had begun. Bible conferences were held to rally conservative believers. They attacked the position of modernism and consolidated their own position. Between 1876 and 1900 several Bible conferences were held and the fundamentalist movement began to develop from these. Especially the Bible conference, which was held in 1895 at Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario, is considered as the most important. In that conference, five points were declared

---

<sup>1)</sup> On this subject, see George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism 1870-1925* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), 3-5, 146; Louis Gasper, *The Fundamentalist Movement, 1930-1956* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1963), 8-12. Norman F. Furniss, *The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954), 14, 26-29; Stewart G. Cole, *The History of Fundamentalism* (New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1931), 53, 335; and Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970), xv-xix. Sandeen has a unique position in that the alliance between Princeton Theology and premillennialism produced fundamentalism. But in general, it is believed that a major catalyst, although not the only one, which brought fundamentalism into existence was the rise of modernism.

concerning the essential doctrines of traditional Protestant Christianity, which anticipated the Northern Presbyterian fundamentalists' five-points of 1910<sup>2)</sup>: (1) the inerrancy of the Scriptures, (2) the virgin birth, (3) the deity of Jesus Christ, (4) the substitutionary atonement, and (5) the physical resurrection of Jesus Christ and His bodily return.<sup>3)</sup>

The fundamentalist movement in America has been viewed too often by some scholars as a social maladjustment, as a product of the conflict between rural and urban cultures, or as a manifestation of antievolutionary and anti-intellectual sentiment.<sup>4)</sup> Ernest Sandeen has suggested that the roots of the movement, including its doctrinal traditions, go much deeper than the social upheaval of the 1920s. He asserts that Princeton Theology and premillennialism are two keys to understanding fundamentalism. For him, premillennialism gave the movement its life and shape, while Princeton Theology provided a structure and well-trained, nationally respected leadership for the movement.<sup>5)</sup>

---

<sup>2)</sup> On this, see Lefferts A. Loetscher, *The Broadening Church* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1954), 98. The five-point doctrinal deliverance was adopted by the General Assembly of 1910 and reaffirmed by the General Assemblies of 1916 and 1923. Attention is needed to be paid to the slight difference between the five points of the Niagara Bible Conference in 1895 and those of the General Assembly in 1910 in that the latter did not include the second coming of Jesus. But on the relation between the two declarations Sandeen suggests the independent character of the latter apart from the former, which is different from the traditional explanation.

<sup>3)</sup> Gasper, *Fundamentalist Movement*, 8-11.

<sup>4)</sup> Furniss, *Fundamentalist Controversy*, 179; see also Richard Hofstadter, *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* (New York: Knopf, 1962), 133.

<sup>5)</sup> Sandeen, *Roots of Fundamentalism*, 103-31.

However, George Marsden, who has a broader view, points out that Sandeen's treatment of fundamentalism fails to deal adequately with the larger phenomenon of the militant, antimodernistic evangelicalism of the 1920s, known at the time as fundamentalism. He acknowledges the importance of premillennialism in fundamentalism, but he places greater stress than Sandeen on other contributing factors, such as nineteenth-century evangelical Protestantism, revivalism, the erosion of a Protestant culture, opposition and antagonism to modernism, and the emphasis on personal morality.<sup>6)</sup>

Marsden, in a sense, reaffirms Sandeen's argument regarding the movement's doctrinal origin. Both agree that the most important source for fundamentalist doctrine was Princeton Theology. Basic to the development of fundamentalism was Princeton's emphasis on the inspiration and authority of the Bible.

With modernism, tendencies toward church union had increased greatly in America, and it was the same with the Presbyterian Church. These tendencies also indicated the spirit of compromise and doctrinal indifference which had spread in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.<sup>7)</sup> It was evident that the importance of doctrine was neglected in general. In facing this trend, Machen, who had graduated from Princeton University and Seminary and had studied at Marburg and

---

<sup>6)</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 5.

<sup>7)</sup> Further reference to the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America will be abbreviated to the PCUSA.

Goettingen, was well aware of the tides of unbelief and attempted to check the spread of liberalism<sup>8)</sup> throughout the ministry of the church.

In fighting against liberalism, he provided the fundamentalist movement with several valuable books such as *The Origin of Paul's Religion, Christianity and Liberalism, What Is Faith?* and *The Virgin Birth of Christ*. Especially, he made clear what was the issue between modernism and traditional Protestant Christianity in the fundamentalist controversy in the book, *Christianity and Liberalism*. Machen's thesis in that book was that liberalism had abandoned everything distinctive in historic Christianity. It was not even a perversion of Christianity like Roman Catholicism, but an entirely different religion.<sup>9)</sup>

Liberalism was a late nineteenth- and early twentieth- century movement seeking to preserve the Christian faith by adjusting traditional Christianity to developments in modern culture. Liberalism, in the general sense of a movement desiring freedom from tradition, has been a recurring impulse throughout the history of Christianity. Within American Protestantism the term "liberalism" or "modernism" refers more precisely to a theological movement in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries which sought to save Christianity from the assault of contemporary intellectual developments by accommodating the traditional faith to modern culture.

---

<sup>8)</sup> Modernism is also called liberalism. On the terms, see J. Gresham Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923), 2.

<sup>9)</sup> *Ibid.*, 7, 52.

In the decades after the Civil War, profound intellectual and social changes rocked the United States. The publication of Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* in 1859 and the consequent spread of evolutionary thought challenged cherished notions about the Bible's accuracy and God's providential design. Developments in the disciplines of biblical studies, history, psychology, sociology and comparative religions led to a relativistic view of truth which added to the forces threatening Victorian orthodoxy. Also, massive immigration, rapid industrialization, skyrocketing urban growth and the gradual secularization of society resulted in pervasive tensions in American society.

American modernists received inspiration from European sources in the philosophy of Immanuel Kant, as well as the religious thought of Friedrich Schleiermacher and Albrecht Ritschl. Liberals contended that experience and feeling, not creeds or doctrine, provided the foundation of Christianity. They insisted that doctrines necessarily required periodic reformulation to adjust to the ever-expanding knowledge of mankind. The most persistent legacy of modernism to American Protestantism was its insistence that Christian theology acknowledge and exploit the involvement of religion and culture.

Immanuel Kant set forth ethics or morality as the focal point of the special religious dimension. Kant created two worlds - the world of phenomena and the world of noumena - that is, the world perceived by reason through the raw material of the senses, and the world postulated by reason concerning God, freedom, and immortality, which are but the



regulative ideas that cannot be perceived by the senses but must have their place in our lives as if they were real objects knowable by reason. By arguing the impossibility to prove the existence of God, the necessity of human freedom, and the immortality of soul by means of the sense-based experience or speculative reason, his work marked the final demise of the deism of the Enlightenment. Religion could be established on the basis of practical reason - ethical dimension of existence and the corresponding moral faculty of the mind. For him, the moral sphere is the proper realm of religion.

Yet the theology produced by Kant's method remained anthropocentric. And it leads inescapably to an emphasis on the divine immanence he himself so strenuously rejected. Ultimately, the "divine voice" universally heard by autonomous human reason - whether pure or practical - is a voice from within the self. It does not comprise a word from the transcendent "beyond." In the case of Kant's proposal, the transcendent God is easily lost in the voice of the categorical imperative found in the depths of human "practical reason."

Because Kant denied that man can know the world of noumena, there is no place in his system for a historical and objective revelation of God in the Bible. To him it is only a man-made book of history, to be subjected to historical criticism just as any other book. There is no place for Christ, the God-man, in Kant's system. Man with his free will and his immanent sense of what is right becomes the creator of a religion in which he develops the morality inherent in himself. In this way Kant helped to

provide a philosophical framework for both higher criticism and modern liberal theology.<sup>10)</sup>

Friedrich Schleiermacher is regarded as the father of modern theology. He was the first systematic theologian, who interpreted Christian faith in terms of the framework as underlined by the Enlightenment. He accepted Kant's distinction between the phenomenal and the noumenal realms, by bringing Christian faith or religion down to the realm of phenomenal. As a result, he identified religion as the feeling of absolute dependence on God, namely, as man's consciousness of the otherness (namely, God) in the community of God (namely, the church). By this definition of religion, Schleiermacher asserted that man was a relational being, and was inseparable from and related with the otherness. Accordingly, Schleiermacher identified man's knowledge of God not with the proposition of Scripture, but with his own inward religious experience or consciousness of God.

Based on his identification of God as man's consciousness of the otherness, Schleiermacher rejects God's personhood. For him, God is the otherness. God is immanent in our heart; every man is able to be conscious of him. Indeed, Schleiermacher's understanding of God is panentheism. Besides, Schleiermacher identifies sin as man's self-

---

<sup>10)</sup> Stanley J. Grenz and Roger E. Olson, *20th-Century Theology: God and the World in a Transitional Age* (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1992), 24-31; Peter Toon, *The End of Liberal Theology: Contemporary Challenges to Evangelical Orthodoxy* (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1995), 47-50; Alasdair I. C. Heron, *A Century of Protestant Theology* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1980), 16-18.

consciousness of himself alone without allowing his being relating to God. According to this definition of sin, Schleiermacher argues that Jesus is a perfect or sinless man in the sense that he is fully conscious of God. He is therefore regarded as a New Being. Through the union with Jesus man can also become a new being.<sup>11)</sup>

Schleiermacher's theology removed the historical and intellectual basis of the orthodox Christianity, and the Bible became irrelevant except as a record of Christian experience. In particular, Machen later reacted against the basic principles of Schleiermacher's theology, which emphasized Christian experience rather than Christian doctrine. He asserted again and again that Christian experience must be primarily grounded upon Christian doctrine and that the order must not be changed.<sup>12)</sup>

He writes concerning the importance of doctrine:

It is the very essence of "conservatism" in the Church to regard doctrinal differences as no trifles but as the matters of supreme moment. A man cannot possibly be an "evangelical" or a "conservative" (or, as he himself would say, simply a Christian) and regard the Cross of Christ as a trifle.<sup>13)</sup>

Albrecht Ritschl disagreed with Schleiermacher's emphasis on religion as the subjective feeling of absolute dependence on God. As Schleiermacher wrote his *The Christian Faith* in 1830, Romanticism or the

---

<sup>11)</sup> Grenz and Olson, *20th-Century Theology*, 39-51; Toon, *End of Liberal Theology*, 48-50; Heron, *Century of Protestant Theology*, 22-32.

<sup>12)</sup> Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism*, 17-53

<sup>13)</sup> *Ibid.*, 161.

element of individualism was prominent. When Ritschl wrote his major work in restating Protestant doctrine, *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, published in three volumes between 1870 and 1874, time had changed to emphasize the Hegelian or Neo-Kantian idealistic philosophy. In this aspect, individual interest had to give way to social concern. In terms of this philosophical atmosphere Ritschl defined Christianity as an ellipse with two foci, namely, Jesus and the church. For Ritschl, Jesus is not a Savior, but an example of moral teacher. The church is the necessary means in the world to bring the kingdom of God in the world, or a means to manifest human moral goodness to the world.

Ritschl's optimistic view of human nature, and his desire to improve human society through education and human moral development made him a major promoter of social reform in the nineteenth century. After Ritschl, the old liberals had the optimistic view of human nature, and perceived that it was possible to reform the society through education or certain social actions.

The most important thing to Ritschl was the idea of the kingdom of God, which he conceived to be the ethical community of love that God establishes among us. Jesus was, according to Ritschl, the founder of that kingdom and the bearer of God's ethical lordship.<sup>14)</sup> He defined Christianity as a religion of absolute ethics, based on the person and work

---

<sup>14)</sup> Werner Georg Kuemmel, *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of Its Problems*, trans. by S. McLean Gilmour and Howard C. Kee (Nashville: Abingdon, 1972), 162-7.

of Jesus Christ, the founder of the kingdom of God. That kingdom, according to Ritschl, is almost equivalent to "the moral unification of the human race, through action prompted by universal love to our neighbour." Thus, religion becomes only a new mode of morality. The kingdom of God, stripped of the eschatological transcendence that belongs to it according to the Gospels, is now hardly more than a Kantian realm of moral ends. Ritschl described the kingdom as "the organization of humanity through action inspired by love." Ethical love is at once the supreme purpose of the Father and man's highest good. For him the kingdom is a divine gift and man's moral task.

Salvation, according to Ritschl, takes place through the mediation of the church, functioning as the community of believers. It is in the society of the faithful that a man enters into a personal relationship with Christ. Being a member of the church, therefore, amounts to being reconciled to God.<sup>15)</sup>

Such was Ritschl's thought.<sup>16)</sup> It influenced many German scholars and theologians, such as Adolf Harnack, Emil Schuerer, Johannes Weiss, and Wilhelm Herrmann, who was Machen's mentor while he was a student at Marburg from October 1905 to the early months of 1906.

Herrmann was not a New Testament scholar but a professor of

---

<sup>15)</sup> Albrecht B. Ritschl, *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, trans. H. R. Mackintosh and A. B. Macaulay (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, [1870] 1900), 550.

<sup>16)</sup> Grenz and Olson, *20th-Century Theology*, 51-59; Toon, *End of Liberal Theology*, 53-54; Heron, *Century of Protestant Theology*, 32-36.

theology, and he was particularly well known as an excellent exponent of Ritschlian or liberal theology. Through him, Machen came into contact with a living and dynamic alternative to the evangelical Christianity in which he was reared. Herrmann's influence was so strong that it threw young Machen into a state of confusion and uncertainty which was not to be resolved for months - or even years - to come.<sup>17)</sup>

Machen continued to fight against liberalism within the PCUSA. In attempting to reform the situation, he formed Westminster Theological Seminary and organized the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.<sup>18)</sup> The church, however, was moving toward "administrative tyranny and theological anarchy."<sup>19)</sup> The Independent Board was barred from the church. This, along with the church's tolerant attitude toward the Auburn Affirmation,<sup>20)</sup> led Machen to declare that his whole church - in administrative effect - had become heretical.<sup>21)</sup> And he founded the Presbyterian Church of America<sup>22)</sup> as a new denomination. He writes

---

<sup>17)</sup> Ned B. Stonehouse, *J. Gresham Machen: A Biographical Memoir* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954), 105. See also Machen, "Christianity in Conflict," in *Contemporary American Theology*, ed. by Vergilius Ferm, I (New York: Round Table Press, 1932), 255-6.

<sup>18)</sup> Further reference to the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions will be abbreviated to the Independent Board.

<sup>19)</sup> Henry W. Coray, *J. Gresham Machen: A Silhouette* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1981), 89. Cf. Loetscher, *Broadening Church*, 151.

<sup>20)</sup> See 56-59 for the church's attitude toward the signers of the Auburn Affirmation.

<sup>21)</sup> Coray, *Silhouette*, 107.

<sup>22)</sup> Further reference to the Presbyterian Church of America will be abbreviated to the PCA. In

about the case in which the evangelical Christians should withdraw from the Church:

If the liberal party ... really obtains control of the Church, evangelical Christians must be prepared to withdraw no matter what it costs. Our Lord has died for us, and surely we must not deny Him for favor of men.<sup>23)</sup>

Furthermore, he warns his readers of the rise of modernism. Paganism enters into the Church in the name of Christianity. It is a terrible crisis of the Church. Therefore, the evangelical Christians should return, with new earnestness, to the study of the Word of God.<sup>24)</sup>

Then he speaks about the difficulty to find the true church:

One hears much, it is true, about Christian union and harmony and co-operation. But the union that is meant is often a union with the world against the Lord, or at best a forced union of machinery and tyrannical committees. How different is the true unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace! Sometimes, it is true, the longing for Christian fellowship is satisfied. There are congregations, even in the present age of conflict, that are really gathered around the table of the crucified Lord; there are pastors that are pastors indeed.

---

civil court the PCUSA sued the PCA for assuming this name. The result was that it was changed to the new name The Orthodox Presbyterian Church in 1939. Cf. "Totalitarian Church in Court Action," *Christian Beacon* 1 (Sep. 17, 1936), 2.

<sup>23)</sup> Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism*, 166.

<sup>24)</sup> *Ibid.*, 177-8.

But such congregations, in many cities, are difficult to find.<sup>25)</sup>

Although Machen long had a vision of forming a new denomination, he and his associates did not leave the PCUSA, but were expelled from it - judicially disciplined - by the modernists. Therefore the validity of their forming the new church - the PCA - is shown on the ground that they were driven from the PCUSA after their effort to reform the church over the issue of apostasy.<sup>26)</sup>

Yet within less than a year after the PCA was formed, in June of 1937, it was divided. Immediately following its Third General Assembly, Carl McIntire and his associates withdrew to form the Bible Presbyterian Synod. The differences between them and the majority who remained in the PCA focused on three distinct issues: dispensationalism, Christian liberty, and church polity. But these differences had already existed between Machen and McIntire before January 1, 1937, when Machen died.

Being an ardent admirer of J. Gresham Machen, McIntire followed the eminent professor from Princeton Seminary to the newly created Westminster Seminary. He received his divinity degree from this institution in 1931. After a short pastorate in Atlantic City, New Jersey, McIntire became pastor of the Collingswood Presbyterian Church on September 28, 1933. He was invited by Machen to become a member of the Independent Board at the age of only 27. He was elected to the board

---

<sup>25)</sup> Ibid., 179.

<sup>26)</sup> Machen, "A True Presbyterian Church at Last," *The Presbyterian Guardian* 2 (Jun. 22, 1936), 110.



on April 10, 1934. Therefore he was included in the Mandate of 1934 by which the PCUSA required its members to leave the Independent Board or be disciplined. He was tried together with the other members of the Independent Board. They suffered together. McIntire united with Machen in forming the PCA.

Many people, including McIntire himself, stated that McIntire had been Machen's ardent admirer.<sup>27)</sup> Machen also liked and praised McIntire.<sup>28)</sup> They continued to maintain a good relationship with each other through early 1936. Especially they had the same position in regard to the missionary crisis resulting from modernism.<sup>29)</sup> They gave great encouragement and help to each other in the fight for the true mission of the church.

---

<sup>27)</sup> *A Brief History of the Bible Presbyterian Church, and Its Agencies*, compiled by Margaret G. Harden, (1967), 34. This book was made at the request of McIntire (3); George P. Hutchinson, *The History Behind the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Evangelical Synod* (Cherry Hill, N. J.: Mack Publishing Co., 1974), 265-6; and see McIntire to Machen, Jun. 3, Jun. 25, 1931, May 22, 1932, Aug. 22, and Sep. 30, 1933, Machen Archives at Westminster Seminary in Philadelphia. McIntire asked Machen to deliver the sermon for his ordination and installation at Chelsea Presbyterian Church in Atlantic City, New Jersey. Also he invited Machen to preach the sermon at his installation at Collingswood Presbyterian Church in Collingswood, New Jersey. And Machen accepted both invitations, especially on the occasion of the latter "with the utmost pleasure."

<sup>28)</sup> Machen to McIntire, Aug. 26, Sep. 6, and Oct. 2, 1933, Machen Archives.

<sup>29)</sup> McIntire to Machen, Oct. 16, Nov. 28, 1933, Sep. 17, Sep. 20, Dec. 3, Dec. 13, Dec. 20, Dec. 21, 1934, May 2, 1935; Machen to McIntire, Oct. 19, Nov. 29, 1933, Sep. 15, Sep. 19, Dec. 6, Dec. 15, Dec. 22, Dec. 28, 1934, Jan. 7, May 6, Jun. 8, Sep. 27, 1935, Machen Archives.

But the rift was developing between Machen and McIntire due to the matters related to the *Christian Beacon*, McIntire's weekly paper.<sup>30)</sup> Becoming quite upset with McIntire,<sup>31)</sup> Machen expressed his grief with McIntire's journalistic methods.<sup>32)</sup> From this point onward the differences of opinion between the two men were apparent. The differences focused on the three distinct issues which became the main issues of differences between the majority and the minority in the PCA.

I intend to throw light on the relationship between Machen and McIntire since there were evidences of great differences between Machen and McIntire during the period from early 1936 to the time of Machen's death. So I will make clear what I consider to be underlying issues of the differences between them.

It seems somewhat strange in view of the importance of Machen and McIntire in the history of the fundamentalist movement that no one has thoroughly studied the relationship between the two men. Such study will be very important in removing some misunderstanding which might have existed in the following generations. It is my conviction that much profit will be gained if some portion of the history of the fundamentalist movement is viewed from the perspective of the relationship between

---

<sup>30)</sup> McIntire to Machen, Jan. 27, Jan. 29, Mar. 5, 1936; Machen to McIntire, Jan. 28, Mar. 5, 1936, Machen Archives.

<sup>31)</sup> Cf. "Presby. Guardian Has New Editor," *Christian Beacon* 1 (Sep. 17, 1936), 2.

<sup>32)</sup> Machen to McIntire, Sep. 25, 1936, Machen Archives. But the file copy indicates that the original letter was not sent to McIntire.

Machen and McIntire. Of course, the perspective should be based on an impartial position without any preconception or prejudice.

In my judgment, Machen had considerable influence on McIntire.<sup>33)</sup> This cannot be denied in the light of the fact that McIntire greatly helped him in the activities or fight for the Independent Board,<sup>34)</sup> and united with him in forming a new denomination.<sup>35)</sup> And the influence Machen had on McIntire should be considered in aspects like opposition to liberalism, hostility to indifferentists, and separatism,<sup>36)</sup> even if McIntire's argument is not completely right.

In the first chapter of this dissertation, I will deal with the historical background over the period from the beginning of American

---

<sup>33)</sup> Carl McIntire, "The Battle," *Catalogue of Faith Seminary, 1937-77*, 25-29. In this catalogue McIntire argues that only Faith Seminary "stands for the purity of the Church, the purity of the Gospel, and the separation that God calls for from all forms of evil and compromise," and continues the true spiritual succession of Machen in view of separatism. Also see Harden, *Brief History*, 19-45; McIntire, *Twentieth Century Reformation* (Collingswood, N.J.: Christian Beacon Press, [1944] 1946), 4-6, 41, 46-47, 196.

<sup>34)</sup> Machen to McIntire, Dec. 28, 1934, Jan. 7, 1935; McIntire to Machen, May 2, 1935, Machen Archives.

<sup>35)</sup> Coray, *Silhouette*, 116, 118; Ned B. Stonehouse, *J. Gresham Machen, A Biographical Memoir* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954), 493, 500-502.

<sup>36)</sup> C. Allyn Russell, "J. Gresham Machen, Scholarly Fundamentalist," (*Journal of Presbyterian History* 51 (1) (1973), 66. Here he calls Machen "the indirect founder of ultrafundamentalism through the separatist action and thought of Carl McIntire."

Presbyterianism to the forming of the PCA in 1936. Here a brief survey will be given for the basis of understanding of the factors in which the common features and differences between Machen and McIntire could be engendered.

In the second chapter, I will deal with Machen's influence on McIntire and the Bible Presbyterian Church. McIntire was an ardent admirer of Machen. He has acknowledged it. Especially, McIntire has been the fervent follower of the separatist principle of Machen. Thus it may be said that Machen had influence on McIntire in terms of the doctrine of the church. The positive and negative aspect of the influence of Machen on McIntire and the Bible Presbyterian Church will be dealt with.

The third chapter will be devoted to examining the differences of thought between Machen and McIntire. While attempting to assess the differences of the theological thought between the two men, the focus of attention here will be on the issues - dispensationalism, Christian liberty, church polity and the relationship between Christianity and culture.

And lastly, in the fourth chapter and conclusion, the influence of Machen and McIntire on the Korean Presbyterian church will be dealt with with special reference to the theological issue including ecclesiology.